

Written Opinion of the International
Searching Authority

PCT/EP 03/10651
Appended Sheet

1. Claim 7 is not clear for the following reasons (Art. 6 PCT):

- a) In lines 14-16 of Claim 7 it is specified that controlled variables (12, 13) are offset against each other for ascertaining control deviations (26, 27). However, this does not appear to be the case, as is detailed below:
- b) From page 5 (line 8) of the specification it can be seen that controlled variable 12 corresponds to the speed of the propeller (n_P). According to Figure 1, this is made available to controlled variable conversion device 19 as input signal 12.
- c) It may be seen on page 6 (lines 8-11) of the specification that controlled variable conversion device 19, as output variable 20, outputs controlled variable 12 (namely, the same speed of the propeller n_P)..
- d) That means, in the case of controlled variable 12, that no offsetting takes place with the other controlled variable (controlled variable 13) for ascertaining control deviations (26, 27).

2. In the characterizing part of independent Claim 1 it is specified that the output variables (30, 31) of the controllers (28, 29) are superimposed with an input control component that is a function of the actual value. In the characterizing part of independent Claims 7 and

12, on the other hand, it is specified that the output variables (30, 31) of the controllers (28, 29) are offset with an input control component that is a function of the actual value. That being the case, the set of claims does not satisfy the requirements according to Article 6 PCT, since the terminology used for the specification of a feature that is essential to the present invention is not being used with unity.

3. Reference is made to the following document:

D1: WADE H L: 'INVERTED DECOUPLING: A NEGLECTED
TECHNIQUE', ADVANCES IN INSTRUMENTATION AND CONTROL,
INSTRUMENT SOCIETY OF AMERICA, RESEARCH TRIANGLE
PARK, US, vol. 51, No.[sic], PART 1, 1996, pp. 357-
369, XP000640494 ISSN: 10540032.

4. Document D1 is considered the most proximate related art. Independent Claims 1, 7 and 12 are drafted in the two-part form (according to Rule 6.3 b) PCT.
5. Independent Claims 1, 7 and 12 specify that, for the calculation of the correcting variables (14, 15), based on the output variables (30, 31) of the controllers (28, 29), an input control component is used that is a function of the actual value.
6. Because of this feature, in combination with the remaining features of the independent claims, it is achieved that the nonlinearity of the controlled system is compensated for. Compared to the related art, and to

what is generally known by one skilled in the art, the achievement of this effect in this manner is regarded as not being obvious. Thus, independent Claims 1, 7 and 12 satisfy the requirements of Article 33(3) PCT.

7. When entering the national or regional phase, especially before the European Patent Office, changes should first be made in order to remove the objections raised under Points 1 and 2 of this notification. In addition, the remaining dependent claims should be adapted to the new independent Claims 1, 7 and 12.